Dialectic by Clark and Plato

Friday, May 31, 2024

Perceptibly, this is a compilation of Geometry, as an analog system of Grammar, that I wrote over a period of 40 years. Intelligibly, it is a system of grammar intimated not only in the Bible, but by grammatical fact.

Geometry is the only system of grammar whereby the two elements of a thing, its relative and correlative, are set in a one-to-one correspondence with the motion of the hand and, providing one is intelligent enough, the mind. If you cannot understand what your own hand is doing, then exactly what can you understand? Are you too, a sycophant of the Einsteins of the world? This makes it the only grammar, as Plato and the Bible intimate, by which your hand can teach you how to reason, achieve the ability to make rational judgments.

Plato called grammar, dialectical, grammar in accordance with the two elements of a thing. Today, what he tried to teach is proven globally by the computer; a computer uses two, and only two parts of speech and it too can process all information and produce all kinds of behaviors in things.

The two elements of a thing, called the one and the many, a relative contained by correlatives, noun and verb, off and on, etc., multiplied by the two elements of a system of grammar, its symbol set and the method of recursively applying them to form the grammar, produce, as intimated in the Bible, four, and only four, categories of Grammar, four systems of mensuration over the whole earth: Common Grammar, Arithmetic, Algebra and Geometry. On the very face of it, if one cannot multiply two times two, which they demonstrate by claiming an infinite variety of grammar systems, denote themselves as mentally incompetent. And as both Plato and the Bible claim, Geometry can afford one with perceptible paradigms, perceptible proof, of every chain of reasoning possible. Binary recursion can only produce a binary result.

Thus, a grammar is afforded by perceptible symbol systems, even geometry, and recursion, no grammar is delimited in terms of the tools by which it is produced, not even geometry. Recursion is not only of the correlative, but the relative as well. Geometry is, however, a system of grammar which requires the most complex tools to produce, such as the computer which goes by the phrase interactive geometry today. This means that the geometry I present in this work is geometry traditionally claimed impossible to produce; it was impossible not because of the geometry, but because man's inability to grasp the fundamentals of grammar. Therefore, I can take not only cube roots, but any root series, and I not only can trisect an angle, I can divide any angle into a number of equal parts, simply because interactive geometry brings to geometry advanced memory management, very difficult to produce on perceptible paper; i.e., interactive geometry virtualizes the grammar better than paper.

There is no processing time in geometry, the output of every figure is concurrent with the input, i.e., computational geometry is independent of the speed even of light.

Every product of geometric computation is exact no matter how complex the computation.

Geometry then, remains in a one-to-one correspondence with the two elements of a thing.

As there are no correct grammar books today which are used in education, mythology is as present today in humanity as it was in primitive mankind. Mankind often uses the word Language when he points to a system of Grammar specific to a particular group of people. Language is Universal and Intelligible, which Grammar is Particular and Perceptible. This means that although we do not all speak the same grammar, we all are attempting to speak the same Language, by biological fact.

My works outside geometry often contain what appears to be metaphor, what some errantly call religion. Geometry is wholly metaphorical, but you cannot claim it is religion, but you can claim it teaches you how to be religiously a follower after the truth of things. Therefore, I will show the bridge in the mind of man to actual religion, its source as a fundamental biological fact.

A mind is potentially the most powerful life support system possible: This is because grammar systems, modeled by perceptible abstractions from things, affords a mind the ability to recursively apply what it has learnt, i.e., the recursion of memory. Therefore, the perceptible is to the correlative, as memory management is to the relative. Or again, in the definition of a thing, of parsed information, a unit is a standard of behavior, or again, a correlative containing a relative, as standard is to the correlative, so to the behavior is to the relative. We, as mind, are biologically responsible for the behavior of the body within which we reside.

Thus, our only power is grammar, or literacy. The only power we can recognize is the power of speech, with our whole body, mind and soul. Therefore, our biology depends on the fact that everything is rendered in terms of speech, i.e., in order to read the Universe, it had to have been spoken. And since it was spoken, it follows that a form of life, such as God, spoke it. What is often forgotten, the correlative is arithmetic, i.e., literal, while the relative is geometric, or metaphorical. There are two types of identity which are applied concurrently, even though, as Plato pointed out, they are reciprocal. Thus, as science is based on the literal, religion is based on the metaphorical. They are not contradictory; they are complimentary and reciprocal. Geometric processing is not inferior to Arithmetic, it is in fact more advanced. Therefore, it is not metaphor which is inferior, it is a biological fact, all meaning, all relative difference, is superior, for that is what we are designed to manage. The arithmetic manages the geometric. Science manages Religion, to make use of its power for survival. So much for Chomsky.

Now, if you cannot manage that simple line of factual reasoning, it does not mean you are smarter, it means you are dumber. You are not a computer; you are a simple calculator. Your job, as a mind, is to regulate your behavior so as to maintain and promote life. The job of a mind, by biological fact, is to manage

the metaphor, or as Plato used to say, the ability to see the similar idea in the many examples. This idea, Aristotle failed to grasp.

Of course, I am not speaking of religion and science as currently practiced by man, or that he practiced in the past. I am speaking of our future. That is our job, predictive behavior to maintain and promote life, thus, The Art of Prophecy as I call it.

The argument over which is right, religion or science is a very old argument, it is the same argument which the Greeks use to have, which is the real, things are constant, or things are always in motion? That is the same as saying, which is true, a noun or a verb? So, the argument is, which defines a thing, its correlative or its relative? We have two, and only two, parts of speech to master, and we do not master them by denying either of a thing's elements. The inability to combine both elements of a thing result in the fact that one cannot even effect recursion or thought itself.

When I was led to the Bible, I found that I could see the science behind the metaphors. I had never seen any other work written that way. The entire Book has its foundation in biological fact. Plato comes close to it, and as Plato said, no man of sense confuses the metaphor with the literal, they combine them in order to do the job of a functional mind.

I am setting out this compilation because I am pursuing an old project which I now call SeeSay. Our own biology demands that we learn to say what we see before we can manage any information about things. As Plato pointed out, we first have a naming convention, by which to name things, we then have to learn how to ask and have that information answer questions in order to learn its behavior, so that we learn how to use it for survival. And as Plato, and the Bible intimate, which grammar affords us the ability to ask and have answered questions about things? Is it not Geometry? We must learn two arts, not only give and keep track of names, but also how to use those names to do our own work. In SeeSay, I use my work to form exercise in practice to say what you see. It will have an appendix of Mathcad write-ups to be used in one's learning process. So, if I do not finish my version of SeeSay, you can use my work to make your own versions of it.